UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Hartshorne's Vision of God - *Edward H. Redman*

The Task of Liberal Education - *James A. Meade*

Woodrow Wilson to Franklin D. Roosevelt
- - - - - - - - *Jacob Trapp*

Thornton Wilder: Literary Prophet - -
- - - - - - - *Harold P. Marley*

Antonio Caso: Mexican Personalist - -
- - - - - - - *John H. Hershey*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXIX NUMBER 2

Chicago, April, 1943

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

John H. Hershey: Minister of the First Congregational Society in West Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

Harold P. Marley: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Dayton, Ohio.

James A. Meade: Prominent in the organization of the American Teachers Union; now with the University of Iowa.

Edward H. Redman: Minister of The Unitarian Church, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Jacob Trapp: Minister of Unity Church, Denver, Colorado.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 19
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 22

ARTICLES—

Hartshorne's Vision of God—EDWARD H. REDMAN 22
The Task of Liberal Education—JAMES A. MEADE 25
Woodrow Wilson to Franklin D. Roosevelt—JACOB TRAPP 27
Thornton Wilder: Literary Prophet—HAROLD P. MARLEY 29
Antonio Caso: Mexican Personalist—JOHN H. HERSHEY 30

POETRY—

There Is a Plan—EDITH L. MARCH 21
Mother of Nations—DONALD WING HATHAWAY 24
Design for Democracies—BERYL V. THOMPSON 26
Retribution—LEE SPENCER 31

THE STUDY TABLE—

Prophetic Passion—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 32
Men of the Eighteenth Century—EDWIN T. BUEHRER 32
The Luminous Vision—ETTA JOSEPHEAN MURFEY 32

THE FIELD—

Unitarian Programs 18
Civil Liberties—*A. C. L. U. Bulletin* 18

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Western Conference

The Ninety-first Annual Session of the Western Unitarian Conference will be held with the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago, on Monday and Tuesday, May 24 and 25. The general theme of the Conference will be "Sources of Religious Insight." The annual sermon will be preached on the evening of the 24th by the Reverend Gerald F. Weary, pastor of The Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Illinois.

May Meetings

The May Meetings of the American Unitarian Association will be held in Boston, Massachusetts, May 26-28. A specially designed program has been arranged to meet the emergencies of the times and the needs of today.

Lake Geneva

The Lake Geneva Unitarian Institute will be held at Conference Point, Williams Bay, Wisconsin, June 20-27.

Civil Liberties

A recent checkup with 122 of the American Civil Liberties Union's correspondents in 41 states showed a remarkable agreement on the effect of the war on civil liberties, confirming the conclusion previously expressed by the Union that there is an almost complete absence of repressive tendencies throughout the country and a surprising freedom of debate and criticism of war issues from every angle. Many parts of the country reported the general climate of freedom as better than a year ago, with less sense of tension or restraint.

The only variations from the almost uniform reports concerned anti-Japanese prejudice in the western states, and the traditional and accentuated conflict over race relations in parts of the South. A continuing wide press hostility to labor's claims was indicated, and in some sections a far more favorable attitude to Negroes' claims. Absence of the anti-German prejudices so violent and widespread in World War I was noted by many correspondents.

In the replies from the Union's correspondents these wartime issues stacked up as far less numerous than the issues not directly related to the war,—discrimination against Negroes, the rights of labor, the rights of Jehovah's Witnesses to carry on their propaganda (cited more often than any other), and scattering cases against Communists. Many correspondents agreed that while repression is absent, there is an evident self-imposed restraint on minority activities. It is remarkable that hardly a case has arisen of action against pacifists such as marked World War I, when scores of teachers were dismissed, pacifist preachers lost their jobs, and public employees of pacifist views were discharged, Roger N. Baldwin, A. C. L. U. director, commented.

—*A. C L. U. Bulletin.*

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIX APRIL, 1943 No. 2

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

The more East and West are brought into contact in this war, the nobler looms the East in contrast with the West. As Gandhi and Churchill lay ill last month, I found myself thinking of some of Gandhi's great statements—"I love them [Englishmen], even as I love my own countrymen"; "I would wait, if need be, for ages rather than seek to attain the freedom of my country through bloody means"; "India has no quarrel with the British people." When has Mr. Churchill ever spoken words like these? Match the British Premier with the Indian Mahatma, in spirit, temper, purpose, ideal—and which is the superior man, and which points the more surely to the salvation of our world? Another comparison is offered by Madame Chiang Kai-shek. Listen to her utterance at Madison Square Garden last month—this woman whose country has been ravaged and people butchered by an alien invader over a period of some six years past:

> Selfishness and complacency in the past have made us pay dearly in terms of human misery and suffering. While it may be difficult for us not to feel bitterness for the injuries we have suffered at the hands of the aggressor, let us remember that recrimination and hatred will lead us nowhere. We should use our energy to better purpose, so that every nation will be enabled to use its native genius and energy for the reconstruction of a permanently progressive world.

Compare, now, with this heroic utterance the utterances of President Roosevelt, whose country has not been touched by the foot of an invader. Search through all the President's speeches, and where can you find a single phrase, or even word, to place worthily beside this speech by China's great lady? Plenty of talk of crushing the enemy, of marching to Berlin and Tokio, of "unconditional surrender," but not a whisper of pity, or forgiveness. We people of the West—we simply haven't got it in us. Force, violence, revenge, arrogance, pride, power—these we are familiar with, and spread as a contagion to other people, as witness our crass imitator, Japan! But mercy, compassion, love, humility, self-abnegation, peace—these we know little of. Yet it is these latter, and not the former, which can alone deliver the world from death. Who can be sorry that the balance is shifting these days from West to East? That the western empires are perishing of their sins, while China and India prepare to take over the destiny of mankind?

II

I have on my right here an Oxford Dictionary, and on my left an Encyclopedia Brittanica. Yet not in all these heavy tomes can I find the words to express what I feel about Hitler's announced determination to wipe out the Jews of Europe by April 1st (the date when this editorial is due to appear). Though I had the tongue of Demosthenes and the pen of Voltaire, I could not say what I yearn to say in denunciation of this greatest crime of history. Says, the *New Leader* (New York), "Such a piling up of horrors never was since the world began." That Hitler will endeavor, to the full limit of his power and ruthlessness, to carry out his hideous resolve, is certain. That he will fail is reasonably as certain. Yet it is estimated that he has already starved or slaughtered not less than three million Jewish souls, and to this grim and ghastly total may conceivably be added as many more. This is Israel's supreme agony, and humanity's supreme shame. To do something to stay this monstrous massacre is rendered well-nigh impossible by the fact that the fate of the Jews has become involved in the war, and all remedies for the woes of mankind wait inevitably upon the ending of this war. Yet it is not too late now to declare that the portals of the United States are open to refugee Jews wherever and whenever they can be found and rescued; and not too early to proclaim that Palestine, as the national homeland of the Jews, shall be established among the first of the post-war settlements. It seems to me incredible that anything should be refused the Jews after this experience of death. The Good Samaritan did not ponder terms and conditions when he found the "beaten and half-dead" traveler by the side of the road from Jerusalem to Jericho. He did what had to be done, at whatever cost and inconvenience to himself, in order to save that wretched man. So with the Jews of earth today! Several millions of them, utterly desperate and wretched, will yet survive

this war. Whatever they want and need must be given them. Hungry, they must be fed; naked, they must be clothed; in prison, they must be freed; homeless, they must be sheltered; without country, they must be given a country. Palestine must be their shrine, and Jerusalem their temple. For once, and as long as may be necessary, the Jews should and therefore must be the favored of mankind. Not otherwise can the dreadful balance of injustice and terror be righted once again.

III

Any idea that Soviet Russia is playing anything but a lone hand in this war is becoming increasingly untenable. Stalin has made not a single move against Japan since Pearl Harbor day. On the contrary, he dwells in peace and amity with that country, and does business with the government in terms of fishing treaties just recently renewed with mutual satisfaction. Stalin made not the slightest endeavor to attend the Casablanca Conference and sent neither Molotov nor any lesser man to represent him; and all endeavors to explain away this conspicuous absence have only served to emphasize its significance. Stalin, in his address to the Red Army on Red Army Day, made no mention of the United Nations except to clamor for a second front, and thus to ignore completely the African operations which the President very properly pointed out are very much of "a second front." Then there is the Kremlin's calm announcement that the Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia—are a part of Russia and are to be retained as such when reconquered. If there could be a clearer indication of the Soviet's intention to play her own hand, which is a lone hand, in the peace settlement, I can't imagine what it would be, unless perhaps the recent statement from Moscow that the Communists in Yugoslavia represent the true government and that General Mikhailovitch and his British supporters are to be disregarded. The United Nations may be united, but what evidence is there that Russia is one of these nations? She acted alone, and strictly in accordance with her own interest, when she signed the non-aggression pact with the Nazis in 1939, and therewith released the war. She acted alone, and in her own interest, when she plunged into unhappy Poland and took over half the country by force of arms, which, by the way, she has definitely stated she does not propose to return to any rehabilitated Poland. She has been acting alone, and in her own interest, ever since—and will do so to the end. The idea that there is anything more or better than this in Russian policy is sheer sentimentalism. Stalin and his associates are realists about this war, and it is high time that we became the same. The Russian people are wonderful, the Red Army incomparable, the Russian victories a miracle. But Stalin is a dictator, and his purposes are his own. The less we fool ourselves now about the Soviets, the less will we be disappointed when the final showdown comes.

IV

It was two years ago that Herbert Hoover was conducting his memorable campaign for the feeding of the starving in Europe. He met with a good deal of indifference—and a certain amount of opposition based upon the charge that to lift the blockade and ship food into Europe would be to feed the Nazis. Now months have passed, millions of miserable people have died, many more millions are starving, and we are beginning to feel alarmed. Churchmen who had the cruel audacity to attack Mr. Hoover for his plea of mercy are beginning to change their minds, and very timidly to urge conditions under which they deem it may be possible to feed the hungry. Everything that Mr. Hoover prophesied, in other words, is now coming true; everything he said could and should be done is now proving feasible; two years after the work of relief should have been started, it is now being taken effectively in hand. The success of famine relief in Greece has of course wrought a beneficent change in the whole situation. In this ancient country, starvation became so acute that even the most cruel of the bitter-enders could not look on unmoved. It was true that Greece was absolutely in control of the Nazi conquerors, and that nothing could be done without the coöperation of the Nazis on the basis of some mutual agreement. But, as usual, where there is a will there is a way—when things have to be done they are done! So food was sent to Greece, and it went to the sufferers and not to the Nazis, just as Mr. Hoover asserted in the beginning was entirely possible. And now at last, after all this delay and all these unnecessary fears, it is thought that what has been achieved in Greece can be achieved elsewhere. The worst areas of hunger in Europe today are the Jewish ghettoes wherever they exist, but more particularly in Poland; the ravaged areas of occupied Russia; and the poorer city areas of Yugoslavia, Poland, Belgium, Norway, and France. In these places out-and-out famine has already begun. Mr. Hoover's idea is that food supplies be purchased in South America with funds of the occupied countries, transported by Swedish ships, and distributed by representatives of the Swedish and the Swiss governments. A somewhat different plan has been put forward by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ. Agreeing absolutely with Mr. Hoover that the plight of the starving populations calls for action, it proposes "the purchase of supplies in the United States, their transport in neutral ships to neutral ports, trans-shipment in sealed cars to the areas of want, and direct distribution to those in most desperate need [by] neutral Red Cross officials." In spirit if not in letter, these programs are the same. They augur well for the future. Not much longer will we have to lie awake nights agonizing over the millions of innocent victims of the Nazi terror left to perish by our war mania.

V

We might as well have it out with one another in the matter of this Austin-Wadsworth manpower bill, now before Congress, providing for the conscription of civilians for labor in war industries. This is total mobilization of the most drastic description. No less a man than the Hon. Bernard M. Baruch, unimpeachable patriot, has denounced the measure as a form of slavery, or "involuntary servitude" as it is called in the U. S. Constitution. Paul McNutt has registered his opposition on the ground that the proposed legislation is unnecessary. Organized labor is of course in full cry against it. Pacifists are unanimously hostile, especially as the bill, as drafted, includes no provision for the recognition and exemption of conscientious objectors. All in all, the chances for the bill, at least in its present form, seem slim. None the less must all enemies of total conscription be on the alert. The war mania is upon us, and may break loose at any time, especially in matters of compulsion and regimentation. It is a habit of government mind to believe that something is done if somebody else is forced to do something! Then there is the administration which is all for centralization of control and the exercise of authority. This Austin-Wadsworth bill, altogether apart from its own particular features, fits right in with the prevailing temper of the time which is necessarily averse to the very liberty for which we are presumed to be fighting. If we would make this purpose real and the war therefore genuine, our task must be everywhere to preserve this liberty, especially here at home where it has so long and so abundantly flourished. Every proposal, therefore, which involves an infringement upon democracy must be regarded with suspicion. The burden of proof, as Mr. McNutt has made clear, must be on the advocates of such proposals. In the case of this manpower bill, the proof has not been offered. The plea of necessity has not been established. Therefore should the bill be defeated, and reliance still be placed upon the fidelity and devotion of our people. I protest against this slander of Americans—and Americans include laboring Americans!—that they can be made to serve their country only under compulsion. This is not true, and never was true. Indeed, it is this very threat of compulsion that tempts to rebellion. Leave Americans free, and they may be trusted to defend their own.

VI

The publication by the University of Chicago Press of John E. Stoner's *S. O. Levinson and the Pact of Paris,* is an event of first-rate importance. Here in this handsome volume is the story of one of the ablest and most devoted men of our generation who single-handed carried the Outlawry of War movement from an idea in his own mind to a program and policy of the great powers of the world. To read how Mr. Levinson began talking with a few friends, and ended with long parleys, and fast agreements with senators, prime ministers and presidents, is like reading a hero-saga clothed in the garb of modern life. Just as a revelation of the character and achievements of a great man, this book is precious. But it is precious also as the history of an important epoch in the annals of humanity's struggle to get rid of war. The decades of 1919-29 and 1929-39 were notable for nothing quite so much as the organized endeavor to establish a durable peace among the nations of the earth, and central to this endeavor was that movement of creative reform which reached its climax in the Briand-Kellogg Pact for the Outlawry of War. As later events so tragically demonstrated, this Pact was born before its time. The world was not yet done with war! But, like a milestone, it marked progress on a road which man must travel to the end if civilization is not to revert to savagery and society to a new dark age. Some day war will be outlawed, along with slavery and kindred abominations, and when that day comes Mr. Levinson will be hailed as its prophet and pioneer. Meanwhile, there is presented in this book the history of what he did. This is history in the best sense of the word, for Mr. Stoner has had access to all the multitudinous documents so carefully preserved at the University, and has used them for the production of a story which is as authoritative as it is exciting. Here is a record set down for posterity to ponder and not forget. There are great events in this story, and great men. There is romance as well as history, and the spice of controversy. Always there is the sweep of personality—the presence of a man who had a vision and refused to let it die within him. What was wonderful about Mr. Levinson was the power that he generated within himself to convert a whole generation to his idea. This power lives anew within this book, and, like a mighty gale, bears all before it. To read these pages is to feel born within oneself anew a faith and hope which even this present war cannot destroy.

There Is a Plan

If crawfish shuttling 'round in turbid pool,
Were told of ocean—great and deep and wide,
'Twould be but natural if he turned and cried,
"There is no sea—to swim in mud, my rule."
Or earth, that tiny fleck of ash now cool,
Might well its primal source—the sun—deride,
Not knowing that it scorns as well its guide.
Yet sea or sun could say so well, "Thou fool."

So man, engulfed in blood and tears, can't see
Beyond the now, and finds The Plan obscured,
In calmer, saner moments seemed assured—
And so he wonders if The Plan could be.
But dark or light still finds true faith serene,
While hope, through every cloud, has always *seen.*

EDITH L. MARCH.

Jottings

White Seal Whiskies announce that their "distilleries are 100 per cent on war production." Why on "war production"? And why "100 per cent"? If the manufacture of typewriters is forbidden for the duration, why is the manufacture of whiskey permitted? If canned goods are rigorously rationed, why not bottled goods? Food, labor, transportation, all go into "booze." Why does this scandal continue?

Now if air-waves could only be rationed as strictly as newsprint paper, we might get some blessed relief from the radio. But perhaps the "soap operas" would be continued and the symphony concerts discontinued, as the newspaper comics go on undiminished, while news and editorials are cut down.

There are abundant signs that the presidential campaign of 1944 has already begun. This means that the campaign, like President Roosevelt's term of office, will be the longest in American history. I fear, also, that it means that the campaign will be the bitterest.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek pleads that we cherish no hatred against our enemies—that we forgive them, and get on with the business of the peace. Respectfully referred to Mr. Rex Stout, Mr. Quentin Reynolds, and Hatred Incorporated generally!

What unnecessary trouble we make for ourselves! In New York, a group of men and women picketing the British Consulate were arrested, tried, and convicted for obstructing traffic. In Chicago, a similar group picketed the British Consulate in that city for a week, and were unmolested. What did New York gain, or Chicago lose, in this episode?

There's "good in everything," said the melancholy Jaques. So there is! In the tragedy of our colleges, for example, there is the "good" that, under the pressure of the war, sports are being put back into their rightful place. Let us hope that they will never emerge again into the swollen circuses that have so long dominated collegiate life.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Hartshorne's Vision of God

EDWARD H. REDMAN

The timeless and unchanging character of religion has been so stressed in orthodox churches, and the language of worship has seemed to the emancipated liberal to be so antique, that there has been a frequent impression to the effect that liberalism, modernism, and Humanism, if not atheism as well, represent an appropriate radical break with the past, so clean-cut and decisive as to eliminate any carrying over into the future of the vagaries of magical, primitive, religious superstitions. The phrase popular metaphysics, for the intellectual emancipated from childish things, expresses aptly the contempt which he feels for any manifestations of piety, as he makes condescending allowance for the foibles of the hoi polloi. In so far as the idea of God is inseparably linked with metaphysics—indeed is the primary concern of metaphysics—which in itself is a most demanding subject for intellectual investigation, there is an element of "sour-grapes" glumness whenever one evades real issues by speaking lightly of them. Yet the defense of popular metaphysics is not my central purpose in this essay but rather it is to discuss the current view of the true metaphysical subject, namely God, as it is to be found in the book, *Man's Vision of God*, written by a capable philosopher, Prof. Charles Hartshorne of the University of Chicago.

Professor Hartshorne's vision of God is by no means that of the God of popular orthodoxy, as it may be found in many churches today, nor is it the God of orthodox theology, although it bears a close resemblance to the God of the new theology of Berdyaev, of Tillich, and of Bennett. There is a problem of translation of such a God to the scenes amid which men are inclined to worship. While Hartshorne's treatment is one which I find intellectually stimulating because of his logical fineness, and his religious awareness, yet among churches and among practical religious philosophies, it seems to me that our own liberal faith, and perhaps especially its humanist segment, comes closer to providing a fitting worship for such a God, than any other kind of religious fellowship.

Our writers and thinkers have set themselves against the kind of God which has been most worshipped by Christians in their traditional churches, partly because the systems of philosophy, in which our leaders have been found, start from the opposite end of the scale, inducing larger truths from the evidence found in lesser things, rather than deducing from the universal the individualities round about us. While something like the kind of God presented by the new theology and by Hartshorne's new logic is a reasonable consequence of scientific Humanism and naturalism, yet there have been so many tangible items on which to speculate that there has seldom been any inclination on the part of liberals and Humanists to concern themselves unduly with ultimate questions, and, of course, God is in some ways to be regarded as the ultimate of ultimates.

Our churches have followed suit with our writers and thinkers, for ours is a movement perhaps more dependent than any other upon the contemporary sources, the literature of the present, and, not unkindly, even upon intellectual, or presumably intellectual, fads. Being liberal has led us to be ever contemporary for fear

that we might in any respect become conventional or traditional. To this extent there is some justification for the hostile criticism of a writer like Hermann Rauschning in his book, *The Redemption of Democracy,* to the effect that Humanism leads to cynicism, and cynicism to barbarism, and, in the mood of the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion in their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life, the assertion that totalitarianism is the consequence of naturalism and of Humanism. Please note that I only remark that there is some justification for such a hostile view toward our humanist position. There is not nearly the degree of justification which our critics assume, for fundamentally the humanist faith in man is the antithesis of any totalitarianism and if Humanism has left itself vulnerable to such critics, it is only for the reason that Humanism has not finished its intellectual task.

There are levels of interpretation, which must never be forgotten in discussing these matters. Faith in God and faith in man are one thing when they are considered philosophically. They are something else when they are examined as a part of the institutional fabric of churches. They possess a character still different when they are seen through the eyes of the average person. Just as some Humanists disdain the God of the creeds and the popular metaphysics of the common man, so likewise hostile critics of Humanism disdain the growing popular indifference to higher values, the lack of commitment to principles of any kind, the sheer opportunism and materialism, rampant in the world, which liberate the average individual from assuming any responsibility to anything beyond his own immediate satisfaction. But such an anarchy of values, such a lack of idealism, of purposeful and meaningful living, is just as inimical to the aim of true Humanism as to the aim of traditional theism.

As it seems to me, it is vain for Humanists and thoughtful theists of the new Protestant variety to vitiate their energies in combat against each other when there stands waiting on the side lines a common enemy, ever watchful of an opportunity for power, finding no means too mean for its self-appointed end, a veritable octopus, master of politics, presumptuous in its blasphemies, villainous in its casuistries, clever in its priestcraft, and the undying enemy of humanity. It is not enough for us to liberate mankind from the tyranny of supernaturalism unless at the same moment we enlist those whom we have liberated for active service in the forces to extend positive democracy. We cannot afford to leave the constructive religious task undone, and if the cause of democratic Humanism requires a full theology as well as a philosophy, in order to gain commitment from the masses which have been liberated, then it well behooves us to consider with some seriousness the specific requirements of a God suited to humanistic worship.

Professor Hartshorne has presented what seems to be a suitable God for Humanists, discovered through the medium of logical possibilities. In order to appreciate the character of such a God, one can, I believe, effect a substitution and interchange the terms God and Humanity throughout his logical framework. If for personal reasons the term God is offensive, the argument will work quite as effectively with the term Humanity in its place, although Humanity, from the point of view of an avowed theist like Hartshorne, will not elicit the same degree of commitment, the same devotion, that it receives from Humanists.

Let us pause for a moment to consider what it is that religious Humanists actually worship, even when they vigorously deny really worshipping. It is a goal of striving, an envisaged stage of approximate perfection yet to be achieved, potential in the present, in the sense that it can be achieved in the future, a totality of human and social values, inherited from the past, existing in the present as something meaningful with the power of exacting commitment, a reason for action, a cause to be supported for its intrinsic value and for its relationship to ultimate values, and as something to be approximately realized in the future. Prof. Oliver L. Reiser has suggested something similar in a passage in his recent book, *The Promise of Scientific Humanism,* when he writes:

> Humanity thus appears as a god in embryo, a developing being with the psychic powers—omniscience and omnipotence—which man has hitherto assigned to his God. Perhaps man will eventually find that he is made in the image of God because God is being made in the image of Humanity.

In another passage of the same work, Reiser expresses this view:

> Humanism has but one commandment: "Have faith in man and the potentialities of his intelligence." Of course—following the example of the classicists—it is well to admire the best that man has thought and accomplished. Humanism does not despise or decry the past attainments of the human race. But above all things else let us also remember, as Nietzsche said, *man must be surpassed.* In a sense, the goal of humanism is super-humanism!

We might add, as surely the theist will, that though it is well to admire the best that man has accomplished rather than the worst, or even the median, yet one cannot honestly ignore the evils perpetrated by men. Surely all of the perversities and obscurancies of ecclesiasticism and totalitarianism, to say nothing of their tyrannies, are also among the works of man, blighting Humanity, impeding Humanity, and destroying Humanity. While man is potentially capable of surpassing himself, he is free to do so for better or for worse, and without some seat of value, some concept eliciting loyalty, which at the same time possesses in itself the reality of existence, the probability is ever present that man will choose the lesser rather than the greater good. It seems to me that the condition is the same whether one believes in Humanity or in God.

The logical analysis submitted by Professor Hartshorne denies the usual assumption that there are only two possibilities in this matter: theism and non-theism. Rather one must approach the subject in terms of the unique category always implied by the term God, the category of perfection, or unsurpassability. Under the conditions of formal logic there will be found not two possibilities merely, but fifteen cases in which there is the possibility of a perfection which can be surpassed by both itself and others, by itself alone, only by others, and not surpassable at all. Hartshorne, himself, chooses a God that stands absolutely perfect in his love, but because of his perfect love can not be at the same time perfectly happy. God's knowledge and God's power are not complete, because God only knows the past and the present, but concerning the future God must await the unfolding of events to perfect his knowledge.

If out of fifteen possible cases and ranks of surpassability in perfection, theism may choose, short of forthright atheism, the first fourteen, and if Humanism, short of giving devotion to an absolutely omniscient and omnipotent being, may choose all except the first case

in the list, then there remain thirteen instances in which theists and Humanists may make common cause. If in advance it is understood that the controversy between traditional theism and traditional atheism, respectively cases one and fifteen, has never been satisfactorily resolved for the reason that both were in error, then, as Hartshorne says, would it not be satisfying to discover that truth lay in a third possibility, legitimate in its own right and more consistent with observable facts than either theism or atheism have previously been?

In discussing the limitation upon God's happiness which springs from his perfect love, Hartshorne writes:

> We know nothing of the nature of benevolence in ourselves if it is not a sharing, at least imaginative, in the interests of others, so that a partial defeat of these interests becomes in a real sense a partial defeat for us. Thus, perfect goodness is not a sufficient condition of all possible bliss. Rather, the good person suffers more than the bad at the spectacle of the badness and suffering of others. The dilemma appears final: *either value is social,* and then its perfection cannot be wholly within the power of any one being, even God; or it is *not social at all,* and then the saying, "God is love," is an error.

Approached humanistically the problem of love and happiness as it exists in the continuing struggle to attain perfect Humanity is no different from this, and it appears that the logic, as well as the practical effect, is the same whether the summary of all value is considered to reside in the individuality of God or in the individuality of Humanity.

Moving onward to the problem of God's existence with the question: "Is there a God?" Hartshorne again analyzes the possibilities and takes his stand in the view that faith in God means trust in the value of choice, the reality of natural laws and reliable uniformities, as well as choice in practical affairs. The difference between believers and non-believers, he believes, "is nothing but a difference in self-consciousness and consistency in regard to what all believe 'at heart,' or in so far as action is the ultimate expression of what a man believes." Pursuing this line further he says:

> To believe is to stand ready to act in a certain way. Now no action, not even suicide, could express the belief in the possible eventual nullity of all action. I must politely decline to entertain the supposition that anyone, except in words, doubts the existence in nature of some factor which is incompatible with eventual unrelieved catastrophe, and in which our acts have their long-run fundamental meaning. Some reliable tendency in nature toward the average production, *even in the infinite long run,* of greater value from acts which embody our best judgment than from those which do not is, so far as I can see, an inescapable implication of ethical concepts.

It is here that Hartshorne suggests the only possible proof for God, using the argument that ultimate existence and ultimate value are one, that whether one starts with the idea of a being worthy of religious loyalty, and thereby comes of necessity to the idea of a world integrated by an all-loving power, or whether, contrariwise, one starts with the idea of a world possessing within itself some tendency toward unity and order, and thereby comes in the end to the idea of an all-loving power as the explication of that unity, the result is the same, and the "coincidence between world-intuition and God-intuition, secular and religious experience, is the only proof for God."

Taken in the sense of sociological realism, the term Humanity would in no way fulfill the logical definition of God which Hartshorne accepts, a being unsurpassable in his perfect knowledge of past and present, but surpassable by himself in the future, since his knowledge must await the events before he can know them, for Humanity, viewed in its historical development and in its present totality, is far from perfect in spite of the potentialities which we who believe in it anticipate for its future. However, the Humanity with which religious Humanists are concerned, is not the Humanity of sociology. It is rather, partly in consequence of our faith, partly because of its fullness of meaning for us, a semantic substitute for the term God, as it is used by Hartshorne, subject to the same logical treatment, the same problems of knowledge, and at the same time the bearer, within itself, of ultimate values, already known in the past and present, yet to be transcended in the future.

The most significant point of all, in this discussion, is suggested by the title of the book, and appears to me to be decisive. Whatever else may be involved in achieving an understanding of God or Humanity, it is nevertheless thinking man who has the vision of God or Humanity. In the great pattern of human development among the works of man, which must also be included among the objects of humanistic devotion and appreciation, is that of metaphysical and logical system-making, leading toward, even when not inspired by, man's vision of God. The errors of orthodoxy and of older theologies were human errors. The new insights and new visions are human ones. Apparently man must have a source of meaning for his existence, a reason for his thoughts and actions, a plumb line to guide him in his decisions. It is not a static object, to which he gives devotion and directs his prayer, but instead it is a growing, changing, and expanding deity, which in itself along with mankind moves in the process of becoming something still greater than it was or now is.

In the face of widespread dangers to democratic liberalism, not only as a living faith but also as a way of life, it well behooves us to consider the contribution which Hartshorne's book can make to our understanding. Perhaps our best response to the menace of Neo-Thomism, Neo-Lutheranism, and Neo-Calvinism, dangers both starkly real and dimly imagined, is to take our stand with a vigorous Neo-Socinianism, incorporating the reasonable faith in the capacities of human nature, which has been our liberal inheritance, with the conviction of metaphysical realism and logical rigor which Hartshorne brings. There is ground for church union among liberals in the marriage of the belief-ful realism of our theists to the physical realism of our Humanists, and if we must discover in our history the father to our faith, let it be, as Hartshorne suggests, none other than Faustus Socinus.

Mother of Nations

Praise be forever for our turning planet
With her blue water and her grey granite,
And all her emerald islands; we are proud
Of every glory—field and peak and cloud.

O Motherland of all lands, ancient Mother!
Home of all homes, our bond to one another—
Be yours our faith, your flag who consecrate,
Hailing love's rainbow down the storm of hate.

DONALD WING HATHAWAY.

The Task of Liberal Education

JAMES A. MEADE

A liberal education is that training and experience which develop the reasoning power and the character of men and women, so that they are able to use their minds as rational human beings, and function as good citizens in a constantly improving civilization. The acid test of thinking ability is the capacity to solve problems: especially the critical problems involved in human relations.

Judged by this standard Abraham Lincoln was an outstanding example of a man with a liberal education, even though he had enjoyed very little formal schooling. His preparation for solving some of the most complex and difficult problems ever confronting a human being may be described as a few months' attendance at a log schoolhouse; the guidance and love of an unusually intelligent and wise stepmother; many years of hard labor as a frontiersman; a marvelous knowledge of men and of human nature; immense sympathy for mankind, and a deep and intensive reading of some of the world's great books.

Judging by these standards it seems clear that comparatively few individuals have ever attained to the intellectual and moral stature of a liberal education; and this situation is sadly unfortunate, since the leadership of such is the world's greatest need.

Without doubt our country and the world face the possibility of unparalleled catastrophe because of the lack of such leadership in the past; and after the close of this second world war, great leadership will be indispensable for recovery and reconstruction within any predictable time.

In recent years much has been said and written about the ideal content of a liberal education, and doubtless experience and reflection will bring about many changes, for no one seems completely satisfied with the product of our liberal arts colleges. Of one thing, however, I feel certain: In some way or another liberal education must be compounded of a certain amount of necessary and useful physical labor, practice in the solution of difficult problems, and a thorough acquaintance with some of the world's greatest books. This implies, of course, a fair picture of the physical world as disclosed by modern science, and of man's part in the history of this world from the most remote times. Possibly much else must be included, but without these elements it will be shallow and inadequate.

Critics of modern education have pointed out that our ability to discover facts by the method of science has far outrun our capacity to make use of these facts constructively for the well-being of mankind. This regrettable fact has a biological explanation, indicated plainly by the very structure of the human brain, and the history of its development.

In the age-long process of man's evolution that portion of his brain known as the basal ganglia—controling his automatic reactions, instincts, and emotions—constitutes by far the most ancient and fully developed center of control over human conduct; while that portion of his brain known as the cerebral cortex—the part that functions as reason, and so builds ships, railroads, airplanes, and radios, and deals with the problems of human relations and religion—that part of the brain is of comparatively recent origin, and in general not sufficiently developed to dominate or give intelligent direction to the impulses originating in the basal ganglia.

Meanwhile, though it is perfectly obvious that emotion arising from activities of the basal ganglia never discovered the usefulness and control of fire, removed from mankind by vaccination the scourge of smallpox, made it possible for uncounted millions to listen to the address of the President from their own fireside, composed a symphony, or wrote the Constitution of the United States,—yet it is also perfectly obvious that in the field of human relations the basal ganglia control human conduct to an extent that is appalling. Without question, during man's age-long creation by the process of evolution, the basal ganglia have rendered absolutely vital survival service and still do so; but with the appearance and development of the cerebral cortex and the ability to reason, the survival and continued progress of civilization and of the race itself depend on the subordination of the primitive lower centers by the higher centers whose function is reason. The objective of a liberal education should be to stimulate, in those individuals able to receive it, the development of the proper functions of the cerebral cortex and its dominance over his primitive and instinctive responses. Modern discovery in all fields of science has given man such control over the forces of nature as to threaten chronic world-wide catastrophe unless directed by intelligence. Never were the problems of human relationships so complex and critical as at the present moment, and their solution demands leadership having native intelligence, plus a sound liberal education. While trusting itself, such leadership must not ever delude itself into regarding the views of any individual, however well trained, benevolent, or wise, as being infallible or final.

A real thinker is bound, sooner or later, to concern himself with the nature of knowledge, and the distinction between truth and error. It seems to me self-evident and indisputable that the most immediate, direct, and plausible knowledge a man can have is the consciousness of his own sense experiences, thoughts, feelings, and aspirations. Unless this primary knowledge is accepted as trustworthy, certainly all secondary avenues of information must be regarded as of doubtful value. Indeed, none of such secondary knowledge can ever be communicated or received if the avenues of the primary sense experiences be lacking.

If one describes some experience involving brightness and color, it may add to the information of a person in possession of his normal sense organs—secondary knowledge to be sure, but reliable; but if a person blind from birth hears the same statement, he does not and cannot receive this secondary information, for obvious reasons. For like reasons a person born deaf cannot receive from another information regarding tone pitch or music, and one always devoid of the sense of smell could receive from another no information regarding odors, because of his inability to have the primary experience.

Probably most of our knowledge is secondary but nevertheless quite trustworthy. However, were it not for our primary experiences, such transmitted information would fail to register, and be meaningless. Every

individual is under obligation to judge for himself, to the best of his ability, the reliability of all such secondary information. To form such judgments, intelligently, often requires more self-confidence, initiative, and mental effort than many persons are capable of displaying. Hence the common reliance, of necessity in many cases, on tradition and authority. Even so, such persons must rely on their own judgment to decide that the tradition or authority invoked is more reliable than the results of their own independent research. Newspapers, magazines, books, lectures, sermons, private conversation, radio, and the movies supply us with most of our secondary knowledge, and much of it is worthy of confidence.

Nearly everyone depends on this procedure in scientific and technical fields, outside his own particular interest or study; and it is a well-known fact that lawyers, doctors, engineers, and other professional men quite properly consult their vocational handbooks for reliable information.

In the most complex and important fields of all—the related fields of social relations, philosophy, and religion—the mass of mankind naturally follow the line of least resistance—the reliance on tradition and authority. Indeed, until such time as free universal education and a superior breed of human beings have resulted in the diffusion of knowledge, thinking ability, and enlightenment far beyond and above the present level, the reliance on authority is inevitable. It should be noted, however, that a deference to authority, over long periods of time, that is too slavish, and unfertilized by research and bold questioning, leads to stagnation and often to dire calamity; and certainly nowhere has this been more sadly true than in the related fields of social relations. The primary objective of a liberal education should be to make men and women critical of authority and of ancient answers, and at the same time intelligent and constructive in seeking better and more practical solutions of vital human problems.

Although the present age far outranks all others in scientific research and discovery, it is still true, now as always, that the world is slow in accepting new truth, and still slower in adjusting its generalizations and its practices in accordance with new truth. The history of civilization is a record of the never ending struggle between the inertia of the smug, the institutionalized, the accepted, and the new truth whose acceptance is often necessary to save mankind from catastrophe.

Man's culture and civilization are still so near to the primitive from which he sprung that comparatively few individuals have the inclination or mental capacity to make the attempt to think through, consciously and intelligently, and adopt as their own, any answers whatever to the most pressing problems of human relationship and destiny.

Only to the extent that men have trusted their own powers of observation and judgment, abandoning all hope of salvation by magic or miracles, have they made real progress in civilization, conquered disease, achieved the modern miracles of science and invention, and made physically possible for the first time a world of plenty and security for all mankind.

Since, beyond question, self-trust and modern scientific methods have accomplished so much in the various fields of natural science, why have they failed so utterly in the fields of man's greatest need—his social and cosmic relations, in other words, the field of religion? I think the correct answer is obvious: men have been unwilling to apply to the solution of these problems, self-trust and the modern method of science. For generations they have witnessed the gradual breakdown and abandonment of ancient explanations of life and the world, in the light of modern knowledge, and they have failed to think through and adopt a more reasonable and adequate religion or life philosophy, consistent with twentieth century information, and suitable for modern man.

Right now the world is passing through a crisis on a scale never before known in human history, because of the unprecedented advance of man's knowledge and control of nature during the last one hundred and fifty years. New and better systems of thought about man and the universe, like new and better generalizations in natural science, such as the kinetic theory, or the theory of evolution, are accepted at first only by the few—the rare few, who have their gift probably by virtue of natural selection. But at the present time the masses of mankind adhere to explanations of life suitable for the intelligence of very young children; and when added knowledge, experience, and reflection cast doubts on the credibility of these explanations, it often happens that the moral codes of these abandoned systems are cast off with the no longer plausible explanations.

This situation constitutes a serious world crisis in modern civilization, and can only be met adequately by an intellectual and moral leadership that is positive, modern, dynamic, and inspired. That such leadership does exist to a certain extent at the present time is well known, but its failure to fire the imagination and secure the practical adherence of any considerable number of persons to the more rational explanations and higher moral standards, is the tragedy of our day.

The chief purpose of a liberal education, rightly understood, is to equip men and women for just such leadership; and the supreme need of today is for individuals with the intelligence, training, and character to supply this leadership, for lack of which the world is perishing.

Design for Democracies

Seven times seven times seven times seven,
Past the moat of Hate
Surrounding the walls of greed
Which enclose the hills of Envy
And the turrets of Intolerance,—
Blowing the trumpet
Of intelligent thinking,
Men will march.

Until from the vibrations of Truth
Intolerance topples
And the hills of envy are level with the plains,
The walls of greed crumble,
And the moat of hate
Is only a shallow creek-bed,
And man can plough and plant
And reap once more
And laugh with his neighbor again
In peace.

BERYL V. THOMPSON.

Woodrow Wilson to Franklin D. Roosevelt

JACOB TRAPP

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

Out of the "bitter enlightenment that buys peace" I, President of the United States during World War I, write to you who are President during the even more terrible war which twenty-five years ago I said was bound to come, unless the civilized nations of the world found within themselves and implemented the will to maintain peace.

My most bitter cup was that America renounced the position of world leadership which was thrust upon her during the last war, and to which now, under your leadership, she is being given a second chance.

It made me sick at heart that that leadership was not exercised when the storm clouds of another impending world war were heavy over the world. There was no rest for me when I saw aggression breaking forth against members of the League, aggressor members booing its proceedings, and America absent from the one council where, if she had exerted a power of leadership, the forces of law as opposed to the forces of arbitrary violence could have proved much the stronger.

When at length those forces of arbitrary violence became so openly and avowedly a threat to the entire world that to wait longer was to invite world-wide disaster and enslavement, you, Mr. Roosevelt, were quick and resourceful in leadership. You persuaded Congress to modify the neutrality laws which had grown out of disillusionment following the first World War, to permit sale of war materials to Great Britain under the ingenious device of lend-lease. You traded warships for island naval bases. You proceeded to build up the armed forces of the United States and gradually to clamp down economic sanctions on Japan.

In all this you were magnificently resourceful. Yet you missed a great and coveted opportunity. You extended lend-lease assistance without strings attached, when the need was so drastic that you could have had ready agreement to peace terms on democratic principles for all the world. It has been said that you have tried not to repeat my mistakes. But to insist on commitments to the principles of democracy for a just and lasting peace was not one of my mistakes. My greatest mistake was not to insist on a similar commitment in the application of those principles at home.

During the war you are losing some of your liberal support, as I did. There are farmers who will want all they can get. Workers, prosperous as never before, become indifferent. Some of your big businessmen and industrialists become intent only on cashing in. Some of your middle group will get caught in the squeeze between workers and paymasters, and resent it. The big job of mobilizing the nation's manpower and resources and of reversing the nation's economy must be done, and done quickly. In these circumstances it is extremely difficult to maintain the home front of democracy. The temptation to take the easy way out and adjourn all politics for the duration is almost irresistible.

Knowing under what terrific pressure from men without faith in or understanding of democracy a president labors during these vast enterprises, I cannot but be disturbed at your giving yourself so wholly to these enterprises and so little to the strengthening of the democratic cause — that cause which could survive even an armed truce with Hitler better than it could survive betrayal by the leaders of Britain and America.

There will be no conscious betrayal on your part. But you may maneuver yourself into a position from which there is no escape or retreat, as I did. The mistake of adjourning politics, which I made, you are repeating. Anxious again not to repeat my errors, you took no part in the recent elections, in which many isolationists, many bitter and vindictive foes of all your policies, not a few of whom were of your own party, were returned to Congress. If the war should end tomorrow, the isolationists would be in the saddle, and there was less inevitability about this now than twenty-five years ago, when the Democratic Party was but a sectional minority.

Other disturbing signs have been analogous to my failure of not sufficiently strengthening the home front. You have failed to ventilate and make over the State Department, in which are men who have continued to be fascist collaborators to this very day. You have failed to come out strongly and directly against the Dies Committee, your bitterest enemies not only, but convicted before the bar of all liberal opinion everywhere of dangerous anti-democratic and pro-fascist activities, from which the only member who was deserving of respect, Representative Voorhis, has resigned. You have subscribed yourself, in a recent communication, to the butcher fascist stooge, Franco, as "your sincere friend." You are proving yourself a superb Commander-in-Chief — a similar standing was ascribed to me by the more generous historians—yet you are in danger of losing all, as I did, through failure as the political leader of the democratic cause.

Let politics be adjourned, we said, for the duration. But politics, in the sense of building up and sustaining democratic pressures to counteract the terrific pressures from the other side, are ten times as important in war as in peace, because in war the sad necessity arises of appeasing reaction at home. Better, as Lincoln did, to let the heathen rage. They are raging anyhow. Better to remember how Lincoln — despite advisors who warned frantically that it would wreck the unity of the North, precipitate slave uprisings, and doom the Union cause to disaster — revitalized the Union cause and ended all danger of British intervention for the South with the master political stroke of his Emancipation Proclamation.

Most disturbing of all to me is your almost complete failure to formulate and announce for our people and our allies a set of war objectives capable of firing their zeal, enthusiasm, and faith in the future. If you are anxious not to repeat my failures—that again was not one of my failures, but rather that I did not stand immovable on those objectives when I went to Paris. Overanxious to have my Covenant at any price, I allowed myself to be drawn into secret bargaining. I thought the peoples of the world could not bear the failure to which my Covenant seemed foredoomed when I arrived among the rapacious victors, and so I made concession after concession in order to rescue one slender shining hope from a Conference without either

vision or humanity. I repeat, my failure was not in the objectives formulated. These aroused an unprecedented enthusiasm and hope among the peoples of the world. These will tower beyond the tragedy of our times and were the greatest thing I had it in me to give. My failure lay in not standing up to the men who in their hearts despised those principles and objectives, and in not appealing to their people beyond them.

I condemn myself, but I do not condemn you. I only plead with you to make democracy at home and the utmost possible application of it throughout the world your foremost and great concern.

I know that you have information which, because of the war, you cannot give out. I know that you must do things which you cannot now explain. I know also that the necessity of winning the war is upon you like a heavy burden day and night.

Nevertheless, if your victory is not to be merely military, this war may not end, as did the last one, in let-down, disillusionment, and bitterness at home—in boys coming back from the battlefield to bonuses, jobs for some, and a period of Vigilantes or 100% American committees clamoring for fascist repression and intolerance, carefully cultivating hatred toward every progressive and liberal idea not only, but toward ideas and intelligence in themselves. It is necessary even now, Mr. Roosevelt, to be moving into a new world in order not to revert to an old world turned sour.

Also, if your victory is not to be merely military, it is necessary to move forward into a new world order. China and India must not again be betrayed after this war, as they were after the last. Russia may not be left out, as she was then. The Heartbreak House of Europe, decimated and ruined as never before, must not again be turned over largely to her former masters, as Germany to the Junkers and militarists (who were given guns to put down revolution), but must be slowly healed of starvation and disease under an International Commission which shall govern and relieve and reconstruct toward the eventual aim of a liberated and federated Europe, whose ancient boundaries must become gateways to the world.

Your recent flight to North Africa, Mr. Roosevelt, was accomplished in less than the time it took Lincoln to visit Grant at a battlefield not far from Washington. The world has become one neighborhood and must submit itself, in international affairs, to one law. The process of making it an even smaller neighborhood will be accelerated after this war, but if that process should take place under conditions of a race between competing powers for air supremacy of the world—as one of your congressmen, a woman! now suggests that it must—then woe to civilization and humanity in the future!

I plead with you then not to counter propaganda with propaganda, but propaganda with more and more democratic deed and conviction. Ideals, convictions, intelligence in the true sense, the hopes and aspirations of humanity—the Fascists have none of these, only lust for power, cunning, lies, the inhuman will to defeat, humiliate, enslave. The great principles are all on your side, if you will but use them. Use them with courage, at home, in the war, and openly unto all the world, and it may be that where I failed you may succeed, and that the principles of democracy may yet become the principles of a liberated mankind.

Woodrow Wilson

* * *

So, perhaps, Wilson might, were he able, speak to Roosevelt. So, it seems to me, his record speaks to us now.

In this hour of the world's history we need courage and conviction, democratic courage and conviction, to state our creed boldly and in utter disregard of any anti-democratic minority whatsoever. For the liberal today this is nothing less than a religious obligation, anything short of which is betrayal of the people as gross and disastrous as betrayal on the field of battle. Shall we dare send our young men out, to give their lives by the tens of thousands, and ourselves show cowardice on the political domestic front, or lack of good faith in regard to the principles for which they may die, as those apply in Africa, the Pacific, and the world of tomorrow?

Abraham Lincoln made a great contribution to the Testament of Democracy. Woodrow Wilson, whose words were as drawn swords, also made such a great contribution, of enlightened principles magnificently set forth. In neither instance, when it came to their humane and far-flung vision for the future, did these men have the support they should have had from the people.

President Roosevelt's great test, and ours, is here and now. The people of the United States, many and significant millions of them, have made a heavy investment in him, an investment of faith and confidence and love. Under his leadership we again go to war—a war costly beyond any individual's imagining. Under his leadership we must look to a time beyond the war in which we shall struggle toward a world made one under humanity, and under all the safeguards and sanctions of enforceable law. May he measure up! Above all, may he be able to measure up through our measuring up!

A TRIAL OFFER

In order to introduce UNITY to new readers, we are offering a trial subscription of one year for $1.00. Persons who desire to avail themselves of this offer should mail subscriptions not later than May 1st to:

UNITY
Abraham Lincoln Centre
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois

Thornton Wilder: Literary Prophet

HAROLD P. MARLEY

If Amos was the first of the literary prophets, Thornton Wilder is the latest. Like the sheeptender from Tekoa, he periodically goes to town, looks around, and then writes down his impressions. The first time, he went to Grover's Corners and in telling about life in a New England village, told America about herself. The play *Our Town* won a Pulitzer prize and won Wilder a place in the Hollywood sun, where he spent a great deal of time before going into the Air Corps Intelligence service.

In the current Broadway success, *The Skin of Our Teeth,* this writer who has turned playwright, goes to town again. This time it is more difficult to locate the place as this strange play deals with the entire earth and with all men since the beginning of human history. Actually, however, it is just as close as the audience in the orchestra seats, for it involves the thinking of Everyman in this present crisis. It talks to him familiarly across the footlights, even leaving our scenes of illicit love and violence which "would hurt some peoples feelings . . . and the theatre isn't a place where people's feelings ought to be hurt." Contrary to the impression that the play is "wacky," is "cockeyed," and is "a philosophy class in a monkey house," it really treats the audience as though it were made up of mature and discerning people. Orsonian tactics are necessary in an age when the shock-point is so high. If the hero in *Our Town* was done up in homespun, this hero seems to jangle over the stage in the armor of a medieval knight.

Here is a play which arouses as much antagonism as did the message of Amos, but it also uses enough finesse in getting across the message of doom to create a positive response in our modern Bethels. The day is gone when it is possible to discredit a prophet by calling him an "outsider," or saying of a play that audience reception is "tepid," and the play would be a "grotesque failure" were it not for the superb acting of Frederic March and Tallulah Bankhead. People who go to the theatre for a cheap thrill leave after the second act, but those who are concerned about life outside on the street see to it that their friends come and learn from the Antrobus family. One critic, who said that the play was as "rational as geometry," might have added that the public is fed up on the smart marriage play, and that there are vastly more figures in geometry than in the triangle. Mr. and Mrs. Antrobus and their two children have their troubles, plenty of them, but these are symptoms of something beneath—the basic things which make for wars, broken homes, and a turning of our backs upon the cultural heritage of the race.

Humanity will survive the present ordeal by the skin of its teeth, but the thing which our writer is most concerned about is whether survival will merely mean status quo or whether we will go on up the ladder. Antrobus, back from World War II, is willing to continue the struggle for better living because of three things. One is "the voice of the people in their confusion and their need." The other two are his family and his books. In other words, he sees an obligation to cultural evolution, thus far, and to the people in their need for security in the days of reconstruction to come. There is always the fearful chance that people will let down and rush back to the movies for free dishes, and put up signs on the lawn: "Keep Off the Grass." More fundamental still, they may fail to recognize in themselves the Cain tendencies which were so apparent in the Antrobus boy.

The play links up the typical convention scenes of American Babbitts with the great game of bingo, but Wilder sees us leaving all this behind in a common concern over greater dangers. Just as Sinclair Lewis made his Babbitt over into a Dodsworth, who could move to higher levels of creativity, so Wilder has made Antrobus, inventor of the wheel and the alphabet, undertake the more vast job of social engineering. Naive Sabina, that lovable servant, closes the play with the line, "Mr. and Mrs. Antrobus! Their heads are full of plans and they're as confident as the first day they began." By an ingenious device, two Negro girls are raised from the position of off-stage flunkies to on-stage performers. One, the daughter of a Baptist minister, represents Plato, and the other, Aristotle. Why not? The Negro has earned his place both in philosophy and behind the footlights, but it takes a courageous playwright to put him there. The present war is symbolically linked up with the last one, when the hero resumes a limp originally acquired from a wound in 1917, but war is forced into line with other great human tragedies, as it should be. There is the long look which Amos had when he put Tyre, Edom, and Moab alongside Israel. People who go to the play, like banqueters to a Belshazzar's feast, cannot escape the handwriting on the wall. "Weighed in the balance and found wanting," and they cannot escape the significance of the last lines, "the end of this play isn't written yet. . . . we have to go on for ages and ages yet."

When our modern prophet goes to town in this play, he has under his arm a number of books as precious to him as books were to George Antrobus. Bible incidents and Bible characters speak — Moses says a few words in Hebrew. In addition to the Greek philosophers mentioned above, he quotes Spinoza as asking whether anything is important, save as it affects the human mind, and whether there is something which is truly good and communicable to man. One volume has a plain jacket. It is *Finnegan's Wake* of James Joyce, to which many parts of the play bear a similarity. Joseph Campbell and Henry Robinson, who have been working three years on a volume, *A Skeleton Key to Finnegan's Wake,* wonder about the ethics involved. Other critics quickly come to Wilder's defense, showing that he made "no effort to conceal the similarity — emphasized it rather, stressing details which with a minimum of ingenuity could be suppressed or altered." Actually, Wilder, as a teacher of English, had mastered the *Wake* before its "skeleton key" was on the market, liked it, and most people are glad that he boldly opened the door for a theatre audience to come in, keys or no keys.

More important than these other sources of inspiration is Wilder's use of Wilder. He follows again the simplified staging of *Our Town,* and he uses a device in the last act which he had in his one-act play *Pullman Car Hiawatha,* published ten years ago. This is to indicate a kind of cosmic interrelation of stars and men, and between the dead and the living, seen first in *The*

Bridge of San Luis Rey. There is a naturalistic mysticism in the line "just like the hours and stars go by over our heads at night, in the same way the ideas and thoughts of the great men are in the air around us all the time, and they're working on us even when we don't know it." In times when man is unfriendly, it is good to feel that Nature is not, and also to believe that the creation of great thoughts has done something for society which it cannot slough off even through negligence or unfriendliness. The continuity of thought, through the ages, Wilder exemplifies in his own writing. He says that his novel *Heaven's My Destination* is only "diluted Dante"; he bases his *Woman of Andros* on the comedy of Terence, *Andria,* and he uses James Joyce in his present play.

Wilder has found his medium in drama and has definitely done something for the theatre as most critics were quick to see, Alexander Woolcott going the entire distance and saying, "the play stood head and shoulders over any comedy ever written for our stage." This playwright prophet who takes liberties with the box office because he has something to say, is not unlike Amos in the Bethel market place, hiring some minstrel to strike up a funeral dirge while he flung out his righteous indignation. He has done some subtle propagandizing, though no one will call this a propaganda play. Everyone felt cold in the first act, and there are many people today who live in cold houses. The bingo in the second act was revolting, but there is still plenty of this, laws to the contrary. Finally, in the refugee scene, and in the last scene with Sabina, everyone felt sorry for "the people in their confusion and their need," — the same *people* which Henry Wallace has been talking about, and long before him a man named Amos, another farmer who knew how to use his eyes, his tongue, and then his pen.

Antonio Caso: Mexican Personalist

JOHN H. HERSHEY

Personalism and the ideal of cultural synthesis are two basic principles of the dean of Mexican philosophers, Antonio Caso, who is influential not only in his own land, but also in other Latin-American countries. A former student, Julio Jimenez Rueda of Mexico City, wrote recently that his teacher, Caso, captured the students with "his temperament, his eloquence, and his intellectual vigor," and influenced them toward "knowing something of the Good, the True, and the Beautiful which so jealously guard their secret." José Vasconcelos, also a Mexican philosopher, calls him "the mental liberator, mapping out new paths for the spirit to follow." In other countries, Caso has been recognized by receiving honorary degrees from the Universities of Buenos Aires, San Marcos of Lima, and Guatemala. He was heartily welcomed in the Argentine capital where he gave lectures in the University of Buenos Aires and also wrote for one of the leading Argentine dailies, *La Prensa.*

Antonio Caso is now Honorary Director of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters of the National University of Mexico. He was born in Mexico City on December 19, 1883, and began his teaching career as professor of logic in the National Preparatory School. Afterward, he taught in the Popular University, an institution for workers and peasants. For more than twenty-five years he was professor in the National University, and at one time was its rector. His brother, Alfonso Caso, also an eminent scholar, is Director of the National Institute of Anthropology and History in Mexico; and his son, Antonio Caso, Jr., is a publisher.

The Mexican philosopher has written many books on such subjects as aesthetics, history, philosophy, religion, culture. This article attempts to give some of the important aspects of Caso's teachings, based mostly on two books: *La Existencia como Economía, como Desinterés y como Caridad* ("Existence as Economy, as Disinterest and as Charity"), written a number of years ago; and *La Persona Humana y el Estado Totalitario* ("The Human Person and the Totalitarian State"), published in 1941. His basic philosophical position will first be considered, to be followed by his attitudes toward society, art, and religion.

In Professor Caso's outlook, three chief orders or realms of being exist in the universe. The first is the purely physical or material order. Things in this realm are divisible and quantitative. But even here things may not necessarily be governed by iron laws, as such elements as the atom may have a degree of spontaneity. The second order is that of life. Individuality, continuity of substance, identity, and function are characteristics of living things; thus life possesses something that is not found in the previous order. The living world has more of reality than the purely physical realm, and life itself is exceptional in the material universe. Furthermore, life as such is egoistic, seeking the "maximum benefit with the minimum of effort" in the struggle for existence. The third order of being is that of persons. Human personality is of a higher realm than mere life. The true person is oriented toward values of truth and beauty and love. Rather than seeking self-interest only, the person gives of himself and sacrifices for others. The law in this order is the "maximum of effort with the minimum of benefit" for self. "Life always desires and the good always gives." The noblest aim of persons is not to have, but to be. Caso says, "To be personal is to assume the supreme manifestation of the real. Nature has an end: the person; culture can only be conceived as the work of persons." This is his doctrine of personalism. But what of the relationship among the three orders of the physical, the vital, and the personal? They are related to one another and coexist. The world of life, for example, gives support to the world of persons. But, according to Caso, the physical does not produce life, and the latter does not create the spiritual.

Another method that aids in the understanding of a philosopher's viewpoint, besides that of stating his positive doctrines, is to know to what he is opposed. Caso rejects Positivism which used to be prevalent among Mexican intellectuals. Gabino Barreda (1818-1881), influenced by Auguste Comte's teachings, was an active apostle of Positivism in Mexico. It is criticized by Caso because, among other reasons, it views the universe through the eyes of science only, whereas he accepts intuition as well as science. He likewise opposes materialism, because life and spirit cannot be reduced to

matter. Absolute determinism is denied, as he believes that scientific laws are statistical laws, and that the universe is spontaneous, active, changing, and multiform in nature. Agnosticism is also rejected, for he affirms definitely the belief in God as divine personality. Pantheism is erroneous because it merges the person in an impersonal cosmic order.

Let us now consider Caso's philosophy of personalism in relation to totalitarianism on the one hand, and what he calls "bourgeois" individualism, on the other. Totalitarianism as manifest in Russia and Germany is "capitalism of the State." They are also similar in denying essential personal liberties; in exalting the State above human beings, considering them mere biological entities rather than autonomous, moral persons. Totalitarianism is the egoism of the State, with individuals serving this "absurd" kind of State. Russia and Germany differ, however, in that the former exaggerates class and the latter, race. Thus from Caso's personalist point of view, totalitarianism stands condemned. But what of bourgeois individualism? Democracies like England and the United States have liberties which are essential for the development of persons. After remarking about the great powers of the President of the United States, Caso writes: "However, the United States of today is one of the greatest powers of the world, in which, nevertheless, the principles of liberalism have their abode: political liberty, individual ownership, and liberty of conscience." But he is critical of the democracies. The reasons are that the democracies are in danger of exalting the individual in his egoism, of emphasizing possessions, of making democracy and liberty chief ends of life instead of important means for the development of persons. He says:

> The contemporary world is nourished by this tremendous insatiable egoism, because it has lost the sense of personal being. The lack of spirituality in the life of the world is that which unchains catastrophes, that which throws individuals against individuals, individuals against States, States against individuals, and the States against themselves.

Personalism, however, means a just society composed of moral persons. The democracies should be modified, he thinks, so as to represent better the economic and political problems of the times. The State ought to guarantee to each person the possibility of developing his own personality. Property should be a right, but not an unlimited right. Unlike bourgeois individualism, *being* rather than *having* ought to be the true aim of individuals. Society should be a "moral union of men," not composed of individuals serving only the State, as there is need for many other kinds of associations by which persons develop. Persons need a relatively free society for the development of their spiritual nature and the achievement of culture.

Such spiritual development finds its flowering in art and religion which are ends beyond mere existence. In Caso's view of art, it is based on "disinterest." In artistic endeavors of various kinds, the aim is not the struggle for survival; instead, the artist is disinterested. Thus a superior principle operates in this field of activity. With regard to the methods of artistic creation, intuition and inspiration play a vital part. Contemplation, he says, engenders the artistic sentiment which is the sentiment of the sublime. Art, for him, is one of the highest forms in which we express ourselves; but there is something of even greater value, namely, Christian love in action. This brings us to a consideration of the Mexican philosopher's view of religion.

The essence of Christianity, according to him, is love. It is love in the sense used in the New Testament, as, for example, in the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians, which he quotes approvingly. Christianity is love or charity in action. It is not a weak religion, but a moral force. Caso sees values in Catholicism and in Protestantism, but hopes for what he calls a "purified" Christianity, with many of the unnecessary accretions of the centuries abandoned and the fundamental principle of love to man and God emphasized.

With regard to the thought of God Caso holds that divine reality is personal, the most personal indeed of all persons. Although the anthropomorphic idea of Deity in the Old Testament needs to be rectified by philosophy, there is truth in its conception that we are made in God's image, because we as finite persons are created in the likeness of the divine personality. God is the synthesis of being and ideal; the real, perfect person. "God is the eternal Thou, the person that synthesizes the plenitude of being." He is the kingdom of ends and the center of values. God as the perfect personality, embodying love and beauty and knowledge, is the highest goal of human persons.

Antonio Caso's vision is that of societies and persons working for an integrated culture, a synthesis of values. Today, scientific pursuit, which is one of the highest human expressions, is predominant, compared to such other forms as art and philosophy and religion. What is needed is a society in which the things of the spirit are held to be of vital importance. Goodness, knowledge, beauty, love are the true ends of human living, and democracy and liberty are important means for our attaining them. Persons in company with others should work for a "culture integrated with the splendor of the supreme values." Scientific investigation, the philosophical quest, artistic endeavor, and Christian love all belong to the culture of the spirit. Caso writes:

> Today as on the first day men accomplish their destiny by the four chief roads of the Spirit—art, music, science, religion, philosophy. . . Broad is the field of human effort and in it all ideals and all souls are contained; the solitary meditation of the ascetic, and the impetuous action of the hero, like the experimental rigor of the scientist and the contemplative attitude of the artist. . . The meditator and the experimentor, the poet and the saint, the hero and the mystic, reflect the innumerable facets of the moral diamond.

Thus in the books of the Mexican philosopher, Antonio Caso, we find beautifully written and fervently expressed the teachings of personalism and cultural synthesis.

Retribution*

The poet's prophecy has come to pass.
The man who leaned upon his hoe and gazed
Upon the ground with stolid mien is loosed
Throughout the world, enraged, aroused at last.
Aware of power he takes his vengeance now
Upon the rulers of his plundered past
In ignorance as deadly in results
As that which pressed the burden on his back
Through all the ages of his slavery.
The earth is shaken with his heavy tread.
Hate is enthroned and love and justice die.
All man has gained is slipping from his grasp
While blind rebellion wars with blinder greed
And both are ignorant that blow for blow
Means naught but never-ending, brutal strife,
That always freedom takes from all to give
To each his rightful share.

LEE SPENCER.

*Written in response to Edwin Markham's "The Man with the Hoe."

The Study Table

Prophetic Passion

MUSINGS AND MEDITATIONS. *By Alexander Alan Steinbach. New York: The Wings Press. 94 pp. $1.25.*

This slender volume is an excellent example of the high type of inspirational literature being produced these days by leaders in Israel. Alexander Alan Steinbach is the beloved rabbi of a flourishing Jewish congregation in Brooklyn, New York. He is a popular and active figure in inter-faith movements, being the President of the Flatbush Inter-faith Council which is doing so much to develop mutual understanding and appreciation between Jewish and Christian groups in this great "Borough of Churches." Besides being a highly successful rabbi and leader in his community, Rabbi Steinbach is also a writer of both sensitive verse and convincing prose.

The themes of these essays range from such realistic topics as "Victory—a New Definition," "Democracy Must Be Preserved," and "Pacifism Versus Militarism," to such poetic and imaginative ones as "Commune with the Stars," "Patient Is Time," "Musings of My Heart," and "Wings" through more specifically religious and inspirational subjects such as "The Future of Religion," "The City of God," and "The Law of Love."

Everywhere the author reveals a heart sensitive to the highest human needs, a burning zeal for social righteousness, a prophetic passion for justice and peace, and an ability to catch in an original turn of speech or in a whimsical phrase some golden truth, some flash of beauty, some priceless nugget of wisdom.

These essays will be read and appreciated, "because," as Stanton A. Coblentz, contemporary American poet, so aptly puts it, the author "pleads on the side of the gods and the angels, and utters a cry which cannot be heard too fully nor too often in this day of materialism and chaos."

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

Men of the Eighteenth Century

EVANGELICALS, REVOLUTIONISTS, AND IDEALISTS. *By Francis J. McConnell. New York-Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 184 pp. $1.50.*

Here, in book form, are the Drew Lectures in Biography, which Bishop McConnell delivered in 1942. Each of the six chapters, or lectures, is devoted to an outstanding Englishman whose life contributed directly to American thought and action during the eighteenth century. It is extremely good reading at a time when America and England are attempting to shoulder the fateful responsibilities of our common cause two centuries later.

The title, cumbersome though it sounds, adequately suggests the contents. Here, in brief and simple form, by one of the masters of simplicity in style and presentation, is a veritable pageantry of the men and the issues of a great century. Those who are specifically dealt with are James Oglethorpe, John Wesley, George Whitefield, Thomas Paine, George Berkeley, and William Wilberforce. Each biographical sketch makes its subject a living personality. Oglethorpe's "yoking of high moral purpose with practical expedients" made his attempt to relieve the hard lot of the debtor a notable enterprise. Tom Paine, as a higher critic of the Bible, betrays the naiveté of Deism; but McConnell makes it clear that the intellectual tools of higher criticism were simply not available in Paine's time, and the negative emphasis was unavoidable. Moreover, Paine did not set out to destroy either a belief in God or in the efficacy of religion. He sought to establish both on surer intellectual foundations.

And what, with all the recent biographies of John Wesley, could anyone—even a Methodist Bishop—say about the founder of Methodism? For one thing, McConnell does not attach the usual significance to Wesley's famous conversion experience at Aldersgate Street Chapel, back in 1738; neither does he regard Wesley's pre-conversion experience in Georgia as quite the failure that many biographers have thought it to be. Wesley was a misfit in Georgia, and he would have been a misfit anywhere in America any time later in his career. Francis Asbury, loyal Englishman though he was, and not too popular in revolutionary America, knew America as Wesley could not have known it, and knew how to lead and expand Methodism under frontier conditions.

The chapter on Wilberforce shows clearly the economic tie-up between England and America, and reveals a tenacious, tireless personality, succeeding at last, with the friendship of the younger Pitt, in cutting the slave trade at its source, and thus preparing the way for emancipation in America.

All in all, this book is further evidence of the broad range of McConnell's thought and the depth of his historic insight. He is America's most conspicuous Methodist, and Methodism's greatest liberal.

EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

The Luminous Vision

INTO THE WIND YOU RISE. *By Enid Daniel Jones. Emory University, Ga.: Banner Press.* $1.50.

This volume deserves all-out praise, for its author has the critical analysis of a psychologist plus the luminous vision of a poet. There is a buoyancy from the first page to the last that lifts us to a higher plane of understanding. *Into the Wind You Rise* is aptly named, for we soar in spirit as we scan its lines. The title poem is more than a vivid description of an aviator; it is a symbol of the hopes and aspirations of all mankind. Here themes are as varied as life itself. Here Euripides rubs elbows with an ancient Chinese painter; Franz Liszt marches along with Emerson; the bells of El Camino Real peal on "a royal road which hails no king"; and as the cadences of her melodious lines drift to a close, we have "Night Among the Sequoias" and

> Silence! as the ancient groves
> Count the cosmic beat.

The Foreword by Lucia Trent and the late Ralph Cheyney is not only a vibrant introduction to this gifted poet but also an eloquent plea for the arts. "The fine arts show us what to look for, music what to listen for, poetry what to live for."

Lovely as the poems are the block prints in pastel blue by Leander Leitner. The Banner Press is to be congratulated on the striking blue and gold format in which these lyrics are enshrined.

ETTA JOSEPHEAN MURFEY.